

**CPAM 2005-0003 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT FOR THE UPPER BROAD RUN AND
UPPER FOLEY TRANSITION SUBAREAS**

**Issue Question— What level of public facilities and services should be
provided in the Upper Foley and Upper Broad Run Transition subareas?**

Prepared: July 25, 2005

#4

(4 of 5)

Background Discussion:

One of the fundamental issues associated with developing new land use policies is the cost of providing public facilities and services to the new development and deciding what proportion the existing residents should pay and how much should be left to the new residents. The privately initiated CPAM applications that led to this consolidated CPAM proposed to accelerate the completion of needed transportation links, offer innovative funding for capital facilities and transportation, and provide “fully amenitized” mixed-use communities.

This paper will outline the status of major facilities and services, provide a summary of current funding policy and guidelines, and offer options and recommendations concerning the level of services to be provided, who should pay for those services, and how the timing of services should relate to new development.

The estimated buildout should not be viewed as a predictive effort, but rather as an estimate of potential. Conditions vary widely parcel by parcel and may be affected over time by market forces, technology changes, regulatory issues, and property owner decisions (e.g. conservation easements). The methodology that was used provides a conservative estimate of residential development but allows a reasonable comparison of the anticipated impacts under each scenario.

For the purposes of this paper, staff proposes to compare four alternative development scenarios in the Upper Foley and Upper Broad Run Transition Subareas. The four scenarios were defined as follows:

1. Current Potential

- Densities based on existing zoning patterns (1 dwelling unit/acre or 1 dwelling unit/3 acres), as adopted in the Revised 1993 Zoning Ordinance, January 2003.
- 100% of net acreage assumed for residential development, based on Revised General Plan, Transition Policy Area.

2. Applicant Proposals

- Densities based on what was proposed in the six privately-initiated CPAMs (3.5 dwelling units/acre).

- 60% of net acreage assumed for residential development (30% assumed to be open space and 10% civic space, as described in the land use mix ratio in Revised General Plan for the Suburban Policy Area).

3. **Revised General Plan Suburban Policy Area**

- Densities based on Plan policies for the Suburban Policy Area which permit residential neighborhoods to develop at 4.0 dwelling units/acre.
- 60% of net acreage assumed for residential development (30% assumed to be open space and 10% civic space, as described in the land use mix ratio in Revised General Plan for the Suburban Policy Area).

4. **1993 Dulles South Area Management Plan (DSAMP)**

- Densities based on policies in DSAMP which call for 3 to 6 dwelling units/acre north of Braddock Road and 1 to 3 dwelling units/acre south of Braddock Road.
- 70% of net acreage assumed for residential development (30% assumed to be open space and civic space, as described in the land use mix ratio in 1993 DSAMP).

When the Board chooses a specific land use approach (density and mix of uses), staff will reexamine the development potential in the two subareas and its impacts on public facilities and services.

Estimated Buildout

The maximum potential additional residential units that could be developed in the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Transition Subareas were calculated for each of the different development scenarios, as described above (*see Table 1*). The analysis is parcel based – that is, each parcel in the two subareas was evaluated to determine whether it was “developable”. The analysis took into consideration environmental constraints such as floodplains, existing uses, and potential development of non-residential uses such as commercial and employment uses (*see Attachment 1: Buildout Analysis Methodology for Alternative Scenarios*).

The unit type mixes, based on current development in the Dulles and Ashburn Communities as well as Countywide were used as comparisons for the different scenarios and to estimate the impacts of public facilities such as schools, libraries, parks, etc. (*see Table 1*).

Table 1: Housing Unit Type Mix

	Single Family Detached	Single Family Attached	Multi-family
Dulles Community	48%	38%	14%
Ashburn Community	30%	29%	41%
Countywide	43%	31%	26%

Source: 2004 Loudoun County Annual Growth Summary.

Under current Plan policies for the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley subareas, a total of 4,571 dwelling units are anticipated with no mix applied (*see Table 2*). Using the 3.5 dwelling units per acre density as proposed in the applicant-initiated CPAMs over the entire Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley subarea, 16,994 dwelling units are anticipated with the mix applied as described above. Using Suburban Policy Area densities of 4 dwelling units per acre, a total of 19,462 dwelling units are anticipated with the mix applied as described above. Using the 1993 DSAMP policies which permit densities up to 6 dwelling units per acre north of Braddock Road and up to 4 dwelling units south of Braddock Road, a total of 30,184 dwelling units are anticipated (22,317 north of Braddock Road and 7,867 south of Braddock Road) with the mix applied as described above. See Table 3 for a breakdown of the amount of units by type anticipated based on the Dulles Community, Ashburn Community, and Countywide development patterns.

Table 2: Estimated Buildout

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	<u>Revised General Plan</u> Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Dwellings	4,571	16,944	19,462	30,184

Table 3: Estimated Dwelling Unit Mix*

Scenarios	Density Dwelling Units/Acre		Ratios								
	UBR	UF	Dulles			Ashburn			County		
			SFD	SFA	MF	SFD	SFA	MF	SFD	SFA	MF
Scenario 1: RGP/Transition Policy Area	Current Zoning		No Mix Applied 4571 SFD			No Mix Applied 4571 SFD			No Mix Applied 4571 SFD		
Scenario 2: Applicant Proposed Densities	3.5	3.5	8157	6458	2379	5098	4928	6968	7307	5268	4419
Scenario 3: RGP/Suburban Policy Area	4.0	4.0	9341	7396	2725	5839	5644	7979	8369	6033	5060
Scenario 4: DSAMP 1993 Densities	4.0 - 6.0	4.0 - 6.0	14488	11470	4226	9055	8753	12376	12979	9356	7848

* For Scenario 1: 100% of net acreage assumed for residential development (based on Revised General Plan, Transition Policy Area).

For Scenario 2: 60% of net acreage assumed for residential development (30% assumed to be open space and civic space).

For Scenarios 3: 60% of net acreage assumed for residential development (30% assumed to be open space and 10% civic space, as described in the land use mix ratio in Revised General Plan for the Suburban Policy Area).

For Scenario 4: 70% of net acreage assumed for residential development (30% assumed to be open space and civic space, as described in the land use mix ratio in 1993 DSAMP).

Facilities Inventory

On February 15, 2005, the Board of Supervisors adopted new Capital Facility Standards and Capital Intensity Factors as developed by the Fiscal Impact Committee. The Capital Facility Standards establish “triggers” that determine the need for, and initiate the process to plan and develop, new facilities. Once the County’s population hits certain thresholds, the standards identify the number and type of new facilities needed by the County to provide its desired levels of service to the community.

These Capital Facility Standards (*see Attachment 2: Adopted Capital Facility Standards*) were used to estimate the need of additional facilities (e.g., schools, fire and rescue stations, sheriff stations, parks, and libraries) under each of the four buildout scenarios. The Adopted Capital Facility Standards vary depending on the type of dwelling unit. Because the potential buildout numbers represent the projected number of all types of dwelling units, staff used existing ratios for the Dulles Community, Ashburn Community, and the County to estimate the number of single family detached, single family attached, and multi-family units that will be generated under three of the four development scenarios (*see Attachment 1: Buildout Analysis Methodology for Alternative Scenarios for the ratios that were used*). All single family units were assumed for Scenario 1 (Current Potential).

In addition, on July 12, 2005, Planning staff met with the heads of various agencies to refine these estimates based on the existing conditions and facilities. This discussion provided an important “reality check” in addition to the formula-driven Capital Facility Standards calculations given the lack of existing facilities in the subareas.

A. Water & Sewer

Fairfax City and Fairfax County provide water to Loudoun County. Contractual agreements ensure the County a supply of up to 46 million gallons of water each day. The Loudoun County Sanitation Authority (LCSA) plans to tap into the Potomac River near Leesburg and add reservoirs in the County. Current demand is approximately 20 million gallons per day. Previous planning efforts in Dulles South led the LCSA to plan for the eventual push of suburban development west into the area now designated the Transition Policy Area. Availability of water will not be an issue for future development in the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Transition subareas.

Like water, sewer capacity will not be an issue in the two subareas. The LCSA has capacity available through the Blue Plains treatment plan in DC for 20 million gallons per day. The Authority is also building the most advanced water treatment plant in the country at its property on Broad Run. Sewer lines and pumping stations have been sized or are designed to be expandable and in most cases the trenches have already been blasted to simplify the addition of parallel sewer lines when needed.

Although the County is capable of providing new developments in the two subareas with water and sewer service, the assumption that new development will bring the benefits of central

utilities to existing residents may not be true based on past experience. Extending utilities into a community where health problems exist or where groundwater resources are spotty has always been a key objective in the planning for Dulles South. It has also been used as justification for approving new development. Unfortunately, new development has not always solved the utility problems of local residents. High connection fees are difficult to finance and often lines are not run through existing communities but rather around them. Old Ashburn is a good example of this issue.

Extending utilities into new areas is the responsibility of the developer. The first developer into an area must construct a system that will also accommodate development of other property in the area. As other development occurs, the original developer is reimbursed through connection fees for constructing system capacity beyond that directly needed for his development. Whether by right or by conditional zoning, the LCSA requires that the cost to extend utilities to a development be borne by the developer.

Utility Policies in the Revised General Plan:

- *Communal water and wastewater systems must be financed by the developer or by those who will be directly served by the system. A financing plan will be required. The financing plan must be designed, organized, and operated to be financially self-sustaining to pay all costs incurred by the LCSA for operation and maintenance and to provide appropriate reserves. The County may provide financial assistance (such as loans or grants) to assist in the construction of such a facility for existing rural communities if the system is needed to solve a significant public health threat (Revised General Plan, Policy 10, p. 2-19).*
- *New central wastewater and water lines and facilities should be constructed in a manner that causes the least environmental risk and visual disruption. Disturbed areas (excluding permanent access easements to reach a facility) should be stabilized with native vegetation. New treatment facilities should be screened with trees, berms, and/or shrubs (Revised General Plan, Policy 12, p. 2-19).*

B. Schools

Loudoun County Schools had a 2004-05 enrollment of 44,011 students served by 3,578 teachers and 3200 support and administrative personnel. The system operated 64 schools during the past school year, including 42 elementary schools, 11 middle schools, 1 intermediate school (grades 8-9), 8 high schools and 2 instructional centers. The average class size was 22.5 students in elementary school, 21.1 students in middle school, and 26.6 students in high school. The 2004-05 operating expenditure per student was \$10,316.

With the exception of the Brambleton community, the Dulles community, including the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley subareas, falls within the Freedom High School/Mercer Middle School attendance area. Approximately 2,700 students went to school in Dulles South in 2004-05. By 2009-10, the number of students is expected to increase to 8,000 based on current growth patterns. High school students in the Dulles community were bussed north to Broad Run High School in Ashburn but in the fall of 2005, Freedom High School in South Riding will open.

According to Service Plan Adopted Capital Facility Standards, an elementary school requires 20 acres, a middle school requires 35 acres, and a high school requires 75 acres.

Four schools will be needed if the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley subareas develop according to the existing zoning of 1 dwelling unit/3 acres and 1 dwelling unit/acre. Under the higher density scenarios, approximately 9 schools will be needed if the two subareas are built out at 3.5 dwelling units/acre, 11 schools will be needed at 4.0 dwelling units/acre, and 15 schools will be needed at DSAMP densities (*see Table 4*).

Table 4. Anticipated Need of Schools

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	Revised General Plan Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Dwellings	4,571	16,944	19,462	30,184
Students	3,700	9,700	11,200	17,300
Capital Facility Standards (CFS) estimate of need*:				
Elementary	2.13	4.44 to 5.68	5.08 to 6.50	5.83 to 7.45
Middle	0.64	1.33 to 1.70	1.52 to 1.94	1.74 to 2.23
High	0.53	1.10 to 1.41	1.26 to 1.61	1.44 to 1.85
Total	3.3	8.79	10.05	15.59
Anticipated Need based on existing conditions**:				
Elementary	2	6	7	10
Middle	1	2	2	3
High	1	1	2	2
Total	4	9	11	15

* Ranges are provided depending on the estimated ratio of SFD/SFA/MF that will be ultimately developed.

** Based on estimates provided at the July 15, 2005 meeting. The anticipated need was derived from the projected demand, the current availability of facilities and services, and location criteria.

School Policies in the Revised General Plan

- *The School Board will determine the need for new public school sites and facilities in Loudoun County. The County will coordinate with the School Board to identify suitable sites based on the Revised General Plan and its land use and growth policies in concert with the School Board's standards and levels of service as adopted by the Board of Supervisors (Revised General Plan, Policy 1, p. 3-9).*
- *The County will acquire school sites in advance of the School Board's recognized short and long-term future needs when these sites are not obtained by dedication from developers to minimize school transportation costs and to structure future planned growth (Revised General Plan, Policy 2, p. 3-9).*
- *Public school sites should be located at the focus of the attendance area and will provide safe and convenient access for students. All public schools will be linked to adjacent neighborhoods by sidewalks or trails on both sides of roadways and crosswalks, and where possible, linked to greenways or trails (Revised General Plan, Policy 4, p. 3-9).*

- *School-related open space and athletic fields will be planned, designed and coordinated with the County's parks and recreation programs and facilities through a referral process (Revised General Plan, Policy 5, p. 3-10).*
- *Proffered public school sites should be made available in the first phase or upon request of the County of every development proposal in order to assure the timely delivery of educational services to the community (Revised General Plan, Policy 7, p. 3-10).*

C. Emergency Services

Fire and rescue service is currently provided to the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley areas by existing stations in Arcola, Aldie and South Riding. If the two subareas are developed under current zoning (i.e., Scenario 1), no additional fire and rescue stations will be needed. At least two additional stations will be required under the higher density scenarios of 3.5 dwelling units/acre and 4.0 dwelling units/acre. Three stations would be needed to serve the DSAMP scenario densities (*see Table 5*).

The number of calls generated in the community and the time it takes to respond to the calls drives the demand for fire and rescue stations. When a fire and rescue station gets more than 2.5 calls per day, planning for an additional facility needs to begin. Established stations can efficiently respond to 2,500 to 3,000 calls per year. A new station may also be needed to fill geographic voids created when response times start to drop. In lower density areas, stations are planned based on a primary response area within a 5-mile radius around the station. In suburban areas a 2.5-mile radius is used for station planning. If the County contemplates higher density development in the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley subareas, additional stations will be driven by both the number of calls and a change to suburban coverage standards.

New stations require a buildable area of 5 acres each. They should be located close to but not necessarily on major corridors and must have access to central utilities and communications. The new stations that will be required in the two subareas will likely be fully staffed by personnel on the County payroll due to the loss of fire and rescue volunteers, an issue that is countywide. The need to pay for personnel adds to the long-term costs of operating fire and rescue stations. Operating costs are not accounted for in this analysis and cannot be addressed through development proffers.

The Sheriff's Office will likely need one additional substation to compliment the station in South Riding under all scenarios above the base density. Location is less of an issue with the Sheriff and they may collocate with fire and rescue station if appropriate. The existing South Riding facility lacks expansion capability. Similar to Fire and Rescue, an important impact for the Sheriff's Office will be personnel and the capacity of County courts and jail. None of these costs have been accounted for in this analysis and cannot be addressed through development proffers.

Table 5. Anticipated Need of Emergency Services

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	Revised General Plan Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Dwellings	4,571	16,944	19,462	30,184
Capital Facility Standards (CFS) estimate of need*:				
Fire and Rescue Station	0.57	1.69 to 1.88	1.93 to 2.16	2.22 to 2.47
Sheriff Substation	0.19	0.56 to 0.63	0.64 to 0.72	0.74 to 0.82
Anticipated Need based on existing conditions**:				
Fire and Rescue Station	0	2	2	3
Sheriff Substation	0	1***	1***	1***

* Ranges are provided depending on the estimated ratio of SFD/SFA/MF that will be ultimately developed.

** Based on estimates provided at the July 15, 2005 meeting. The anticipated need was derived from the projected demand, the current availability of facilities and services, and location criteria.

*** Collocation with Fire/Rescue is likely with suitable locations.

Fire and Rescue Services Policies in the Revised General Plan

- *Fire and rescue facilities will be sited in accordance with the standards and facility needs identified in the Board of Supervisors adopted Fire and Rescue Services Plan and station location/service area maps contained in the Revised General Plan and area plans (Revised General Plan, Policy 1, p. 3-13).*
- *As part of a rezoning, the County will require sprinklers to be installed in all new residential construction that is located in excess of the travel distance requirements in the Fire and Rescue Services Plan (Revised General Plan, Policy 2, p. 3-13).*

D. Parks & Recreation

For fiscal planning purposes, Parks and Recreation facilities are described in terms of parks (community, district and regional) and centers (recreation, senior and teen). The parks may consist of both passive and active recreation facilities and may be associated with specific resources (e.g., linear parks along important waterways and connections between destinations). Demand for recreation facilities is localized and specific needs change overtime. The facilities that are currently in growing demand include dog parks and adventure sports facilities.

The Dulles South community currently lacks a regional park and any development scenario should incorporate such a facility. The Bull Run stream, which runs along the southern edge of the Lower Foley subarea, is a unique natural feature that could be protected as a passive recreation area.

If the two subareas are developed under current zoning (Scenario 1), one additional regional park, one senior center, and one recreation center will likely be needed. If the two subareas are developed at 3.5 dwelling units/acre (Scenario 2), one district park, three community parks, one regional park, one senior center, and one recreation center will likely be needed. If the two subareas are developed at 4.0 dwelling units/acre (Scenario 3), one district park, four community parks, one regional park, one senior center, and one recreation center will be likely needed. If the two subareas are developed at DSAMP densities (Scenario 4), two district parks, five community parks, one regional park, two senior centers, and one recreation center will likely be needed (*see Table 6*).

Table 6. Anticipated Need of Parks and Recreational Facilities

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	Revised General Plan Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Dwellings	4,571	16,944	19,462	30,184
Capital Facility Standards (CFS) estimate of need*:				
District Park	0.57	1.69 to 1.88	1.93 to 2.16	3.00 to 3.35
Community park	1.43	4.22 to 4.71	4.83 to 5.39	7.5 to 8.37
Regional Park	0.19	0.56 to .63	0.64 to 0.72	1.00 to 1.12
Senior Center	0.17	0.51 to 0.57	0.58 to 0.65	0.91 to 1.01
Teen Center	0.06	0.17 to 0.19	0.20 to 0.22	0.31 to 0.34
Recreation Center	0.19	0.56 to 0.63	0.64 to .72	1.00 to 1.12
Anticipated Need based on existing conditions**:				
District Park	0	1	1	2
Community park		3	4	5
Regional Park	1	1	1	1
Senior Center	1	1	1	2
Teen Center				
Recreation Center	1	1	1	1

* Ranges are provided depending on the estimated ratio of SFD/SFA/MF that will be ultimately developed.

** Based on estimates provided at the July 15, 2005 meeting. The anticipated need was derived from the projected demand, the current availability of facilities and services, and location criteria.

Parks, Recreation, and Community Services Policies in the Revised General Plan

- *The County will continue to seek private sector support and state and federal funding for the provision of current and future Parks, Recreation, and Community Services facilities (Revised General Plan, Policy 2, p. 3-14).*
- *The County encourages the contiguous development of regional linear parks, trails, and natural open space corridors to provide pedestrian links and preserve environmental and aesthetic resources (Revised General Plan, Policy 3, p. 3-15).*

- *The County will continue to work with the U.S. Department of the Interior, the Conservation Management Institute, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority, and the incorporated Towns to define and recommend areas for open-space preservation and development of a trail system that links the County's natural, historic, and recreational resources (Revised General Plan, Policy 5, p. 3-15).*
- *School related open space and facilities will be planned, designed, and coordinated with parks, recreation and community services facilities to function effectively as multi-purpose community facilities (Revised General Plan, Policy 6, p. 3-15).*

E. Libraries

An important measure of the overall health of a community is library usage, and Loudoun residents' use is consistently higher than the national average according to community surveys. The County's library system includes seven facilities: Rust Library in Leesburg, Eastern Loudoun Regional Library in the Cascades area, Sterling Park Library, Middleburg Library, Purcellville Library, Lovettsville Library and the newly opened Ashburn Library.

A regional library is planned for the Stone Ridge community and would serve the two subareas under current planned densities. An additional library would be needed for Scenarios 2 and 4 (3.5 dwelling units/acre and 4.0 dwelling units/acre) and two additional libraries would be needed to serve the DSAMP scenario densities (*see Table 7*). The Transition area, being centrally located among the existing libraries, also offers an opportunity to meet the libraries need for administrative space.

Table 7. Anticipated Need of Libraries

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	<u>Revised General Plan</u> Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Dwellings	4,571	16,944	19,462	30,184
Capital Facility Standards (CFS) estimate of need*:				
Libraries	0.29	0.84 to 0.94	0.97 to 1.08	1.50 to 1.67
Anticipated Need based on existing conditions**:				
Libraries	0	1	1	2

* Ranges are provided depending on the estimated ratio of SFD/SFA/MF that will be ultimately developed.

** Based on estimates provided at the July 15, 2005 meeting. The anticipated need was derived from the projected demand, the current availability of facilities and services, and location criteria.

Library Policies in the Revised General Plan

- *Library Services sites should be highly visible with direct access to a collector road, and connected to the pedestrian transportation network. Where appropriate, libraries should be located with or near other "high traffic" areas such as town centers and commercial areas (Revised General Plan, Policy 1, p. 3-10).*

F. Human Services

Every segment of the County's population is growing, including people needing the County's human services. Recent trends of particular importance to local agencies are the rising number of youths, senior citizens, two income households, as well as Loudoun's growing diversity. These demographic patterns are requiring additional County services related to the provision of affordable housing, affordable health care, affordable childcare, and community alternatives for youth, transportation, and other public services.

Human services are provided by the Department of Social Services; the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services; the Juvenile Court Services Unit; Health Services; the Office of Housing Services; and the Victim Witness program of the Commonwealth's Attorney's Office. The Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services operates thirteen supportive living facilities (group homes and townhomes): three in Purcellville, two in Ashburn Farm, four in Ashburn, two in Cascades, two in Sugarland Run (unbuilt), two in Leesburg, one in Sterling, one in Stone Ridge, and one in Brambleton.

No additional human service facilities would be needed serve the two subareas under current planned densities. Three additional facilities would be needed for Scenario 2 (3.5 dwelling units/acre), including a mental retardation residential facility, a mental health residential facility, and a transitional homeless shelter. Four additional facilities would be needed for Scenario 3 (4.0 dwelling units/acre), including a mental retardation residential facility, a mental health residential facility, a transitional homeless shelter, and an emergency homeless shelter. Five additional facilities would be needed for Scenario 4 (DSAMP densities), including a mental retardation residential facility, two mental health residential facility, a transitional homeless shelter, and an emergency homeless shelter (*see Table 8*).

Table 8. Anticipated Need of Human Service Facilities

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	Revised General Plan Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Dwellings	4,571	16,944	19,462	30,184
Capital Facility Standards (CFS) estimate of need*:				
MR Residential Facility	0.67	1.96 to 2.19	2.25 to 2.51	3.49 to 3.89
MH Residential Facility	0.98	2.88 to 3.21	3.30 to 3.68	5.11 to 5.71
MHSA Adolescents Treatment Center	0.14	0.40 to 0.45	0.46 to 0.51	0.71 to 0.79
MHSA Group Home	0.19	0.56 to 0.63	0.64 to 0.72	1.01 to 1.12
Juvenile Detention Center	0.04	0.13 to 0.14	0.15 to 0.16	0.23 to 0.25
Youth Shelter	0.05	0.15 to 0.17	0.18 to 0.20	0.27 to 0.30
Transitional Homeless Shelter	0.15	0.45 to 0.50	0.51 to 0.57	0.79 to 0.88
Emergency Homeless Shelter	0.13	0.38 to 0.42	0.43 to 0.48	0.67 to 0.75
Transitional Ind. Living Res.	0.06	0.17 to 0.19	0.19 to 0.22	0.30 to 0.33
Anticipated Need based on existing conditions**:				
MR Residential Facility	0	1	1	1
MH Residential Facility	0	1	1	2
MHSA Adolescents Treatment Center	0	0	0	0
MHSA Group Home	0	0	0	0
Juvenile Detention Center	0	0	0	0
Youth Shelter	0	0	0	0
Transitional Homeless Shelter	0	1	1	1
Emergency Homeless Shelter	0	0	1	1
Transitional Ind. Living Res.	0	0	0	0

* Ranges are provided depending on the estimated ratio of SFD/SFA/MF that will be ultimately developed.

** Based on estimates provided at the July 15, 2005 meeting. The anticipated need was derived from the projected demand, the current availability of facilities and services, and location criteria.

Human Services Policies in the Revised General Plan

- *Human service agencies will coordinate facility needs and location criteria for group care facilities to ensure adequate dispersal throughout the County (Revised General Plan, Policy 2, p. 3-14).*
- *The County will support and encourage public, private, and public/private partnerships to develop sustainable housing facilities to support the needs of special population groups, including the elderly, the mentally and physically handicapped, low income persons, and the homeless (Revised General Plan, Policy 3, p. 3-14).*

Transportation and Roads

In the Dulles South community, the Countywide Transportation Plan focuses on Route 50 and associated parallel roads. North-south road plans include the planned Route 648 Relocated (Route 860), Route 659 and Route 659 Relocated. In the Dulles South community, Route 50 is the only major east to west road to Fairfax County. In 2004, VDOT traffic counts indicated that Route 50 carried 19,000 average daily trips (ADT) near Route 15 and 31,000 ADT near Route 606. This is up from 15,000 and 26,000 ADT in 2000. Between Route 15 and Lenah, the road operates at a Level of Service “F”. Roadways that are operating at a Level of Service “F” have heavily congested flow and traffic demand that exceeds existing capacity¹.

Depending on the buildout scenario the Commission wishes to consider, ultimately the road development in the subareas will generate between 44,000 and 173,000 vehicle trips per day (*see Table 9*). The land use mix will ultimately determine specific characteristics of the traffic (peak hour trips, direction, type of vehicles, etc).

Table 9. Additional Trips per Day

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	<u>Revised General Plan</u> Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Dwellings	4,571	16,944	19,462	30,184
Trips per day	43,700	131,900	151,000	173,200

¹ **Level of Service (LOS):** A qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of such factors as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and safety. Traffic flow conditions are divided into six levels of service (LOS) ranging from LOS “A” (ideal, free flow) through LOS “F” (breakdown). The Northern Virginia Transportation Coordinating Council (TCC) coined a seventh LOS “G” to describe the breakdown in travel conditions over an expanded peak period (Countywide CTP, Glossary, p. G-2).

While building the local network will be important, moving the traffic volume north and south in Loudoun County will have no benefit to the major traffic issues if it is not associated with improvements that remove the bottlenecks at eastern Route 7 in Loudoun and Fairfax Counties, Route 50 in Loudoun and Fairfax Counties, Route 606, and the Route 607 Corridor.

When the Board chooses a specific land use approach (density, development pattern, and mix of uses), staff will reexamine the development potential in the two subareas and its impacts on transportation and roads.

Existing Funding Policy and Guidelines

County funding policies call for an equitable sharing of costs between the public and private sectors. The County takes responsibility for the services needed by development permitted by current zoning. Current policy stipulates that the Board will use a range of funding mechanisms including special tax districts, bonds, impact fees and other financial tools. The constraining factor is a self-imposed limit on debt set by the Board's 1984 Fiscal Policy as amended. That limit is set by separate Board resolution outside of the Comprehensive Plan.

If a development proposes to change their zoning, they are then responsible for the incremental increase in service demand over what is permitted by the current zoning. That increment is determined through an analysis of per capita and per child costs of various capital facilities. This *fair share* approach also allows the developer to pay through installments as houses are built. The Board's 2005 proposed changes to the proffer guidelines allow a developer more ways to satisfy their capital facilities contribution. The most significant is the ability to credit transportation proffers towards capital facilities if the transportation proffers go beyond mitigating their traffic impacts. To date, trails, park and ride lots, additional regional road improvements have been credited to capital facilities. While this change reflects the Board's concern about transportation issues, it does further aggravate the capital facilities levels of other services.

A. Capital Intensity Factor

County agencies have established service levels that determine the need and location of new facilities and programs. These have been consolidated to form the County's Capital Intensity Factor (CIF) by which the impacts of new development on public services are measured. The CIF is currently assessed at:

Single Family Detached:	\$37,660
Single Family Attached:	\$22,291
Multi-family:	\$12,611

B. Proffers

The proffer system is voluntary and flexible, which allows contributions to be tailored to specific capital needs. However, the proffer system is a reactive system based on the market and on

development decisions made by individual landowners. There is uncertainty about which or when land development proposals will be built and capital funding from proffers consistently lags behind demand for the service or facility. The fragmented nature of the system makes it unreliable as a source of significant levels of capital funding. Historically, Loudoun County proffers have offset only a minimal percentage of projected capital expenditures. In the FY05-FY10 Proposed Capital Plan, two percent of the total Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projected expenditures are from a combination of cash or land proffers totaling \$18.6 million over the six-year plan (FY 2006 Adopted Fiscal Plan, p. 633). The County will continue to use the proffer system, but by themselves, proffers will continue to be only a minor part of the necessary capital program and none of the operating funding.

Based on the Plan's proffer guidelines, the County does not envision new development contributing to the capital facility needs of the underlying base zoning. In any of the scenarios outlined in this report, the County will bear the cost of the development permitted under current zoning. Other changes adopted in 2005, particularly the method of calculating the developer's credit for the "by-right" units, allowing transportation improvements to count towards capital facilities costs and giving partial credit to privately owned facilities, will significantly reduce the anticipated proffer contribution to capital costs (*see Attachment 3: Board Proffer Policy Revisions, February 2005*).

In preparation for the Commission's discussion, the current capital needs assessment has been used to measure the impact of the four development scenarios and to estimate capital facilities proffers that will be offered by development applicants based on County guidelines (*see Table 10*). These costs do not reflect the future costs of operating, staffing, and maintaining these facilities, or the credit for affordable housing units. For example, the 2004-05 operating expenditure per student in the Loudoun County school system was \$10,316.

Table 10. Estimate of Capital Costs

	Current Potential	Applicant Proposals	<u>Revised General Plan</u> Suburban Area	1993 DSAMP
Density	Existing Zoning (0.33 and 1.0 du/ac)	3.5 du/ac	4.0 du/ac	4.0 du/ac south of Braddock and 6.0 du/ac north of Braddock
Housing Units	4,571	16,994	19,462	30,184
Population	14,307	47,101	53,940	83,658
Students	3,657	9,738	11,151	17,296
Anticipated Capital Cost	\$172,143,860	\$481,149,467	\$551,011,271	\$854,589,936
County share of costs	\$172,143,860	\$172,143,860	\$172,143,860	\$172,143,860
Development Share	\$0	\$309,005,607	\$378,867,411	\$682,446,076

Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Policies in the Revised General Plan

- *The County seeks to maintain an affordable real-property tax rate by balancing, on a timely basis, residential and non-residential development in conformance with the overall policies of the Revised General Plan (Revised General Plan, Policy 2, p. 3-2).*

- *The County will seek the provision of necessary public facilities, utilities, and infrastructure concurrent with development through a variety of mechanisms such as proffers, user fees, impact fees, and special taxing districts (Revised General Plan, Policy 4, p. 3-2).*
- *The County will direct the majority of public investments into currently developed communities, towns and areas of the County where development is planned according to the Comprehensive Plan and in observance of standards and levels as approved in the Board of Supervisors' Adopted Service Plans and Levels and as subsequently amended (Revised General Plan, Policy 6, p. 3-4).*
- *Consistent with the Va. Code Sec. 15.2-2283 and 15.2-2284, the County will consider the adequacy of public facilities and services when reviewing any zoning application for more intensive use or density. To fairly implement and apply this policy, the County will consider the following:*
 - a. existing facilities;*
 - b. facilities included in the capital improvements program;*
 - c. the ability of the County to finance facilities under debt standards established by its fiscal policies;*
 - d. service level standards established by approved service plans and the effect of existing and approved development, and the proposed development, on those standards;*
 - e. service levels on the existing transportation system; the effect of existing and approved development and the proposed development of those service levels and the effect of proposed roads which are funded for construction;*
 - f. commitments to phase the proposed development to the availability of adequate services and facilities; and*
 - g. other mechanisms or analyses as the County may employ that measure the adequacy of such services and facilities for various areas or that measure the County's ability to establish adequate services and facilities (Revised General Plan, Policy 8, p. 3-4).*

Proffer Policies in the Revised General Plan

- *The County will consider proposals of the timely dedication of land, cash, and in-kind assistance from the development community in the provision of needed and/or mandated (by federal or state government) public facilities identified in the adopted Comprehensive Plan, Agency Service Plans, area management plans, the Capital Improvement Program or the Capital Needs Assessment Document (Revised General Plan, Policy 7, p. 3-4).*
- *The County expects that proposals of public facility and utility assistance by residential developers would be in conjunction with any rezoning request seeking approval of densities above existing zoning (Revised General Plan, Policy 9, p. 3-4).*
- *The County will seek to ensure that an equitable and a proportionate share of public capital facility and infrastructure development costs that are directly attributable to a particular development project will be financed by the users or beneficiaries (Revised General Plan, Policy 10, p. 3-4).*
- *Specific proffer guidelines may be amended through the area plan process (Revised General Plan, Policy 4, p. 3-5).*
- *In addition to capital facilities improvements, the County anticipates that transportation proffers will be sufficient to mitigate the impact of traffic generated by the development throughout the road system (Revised General Plan, Policy 5, p. 3-5).*
- *Proffers involving cash contributions will provide for annual adjustments based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI) (Revised General Plan, Policy 6, p. 3-5).*

- Proffers may be phased (Revised General Plan, Policy 7, p. 3-5).
- For the purposes of evaluating proffers, the per-acre value for public use land that does not require any improvements to be completed by the developer will be determined on the applicant's undeveloped parcel in a pre-rezoned state. For improved sites, the following shall be taken into consideration during proffer evaluation as applicable:
 - Site-preparation improvements such as clearing and grubbing, grading, stormwater management, erosion control, and related engineering and permitting costs.
 - A proportional share of improvements directly related to providing access to the site (pedestrian underpasses, construction of adjacent streets, trails, and sidewalks).
 - A proportional share of project infrastructure such as stormwater management ponds, sanitary sewer lines and major off-site and on-site roadways serving the site (Revised General Plan, Policy 8, p. 3-5).
- Proffers may include additional specifically proffered improvements, as consistent with adopted service plans and levels, the Capital Needs Assessment and the Capital Improvements Plan (Revised General Plan, Policy 9 p. 3-5).
- Proffers related to adult/retirement communities will be evaluated based on Revised General Plan proffer guidelines. The Board of Supervisors may consider differences between such uses and conventional residential development (e.g., reduced numbers of school children, increased human services demand) in estimating the capital facilities needs associated with the development (Revised General Plan, Policy 10, p. 3-6).
- The County will develop a comprehensive approach to the review, approval and management of proffers that will implement the policies of this Plan. Such approach will recognize and seek to minimize adverse impacts and to maximize positive benefits to ultimate end-users and to the County as a service-provider (Revised General Plan, Policy 11, p. 3-6).
- To assist the County in an equitable and uniform evaluation of developer proffers and other proposals for densities above the specified base density for each planning policy area, which otherwise conform with the policies of this plan, the County anticipates developer assistance valued at 100 percent of capital facility costs per dwelling unit (Revised General Plan, Policy 1, p. 11-1).

Public Input:

The Planning Commission hosted several meetings specifically designed to hear from the community on the proposed plan amendment. The Commission hosted two community input sessions on March 30 and April 11, 2005, a Stakeholders' meeting on May 23, 2005, and a property owners' meeting on June 27, 2005. The Commission also received numerous written comments and e-mails regarding the plan amendment.

Facilities and Services

Several speakers expressed support for additional residential growth in the subareas, stating that new developments will provide opportunities for improved transportation networks and bring needed services to existing developments within the Route 50 corridor. One speaker stated that there is a services deficit in the South Riding community and that the CPAM offers an opportunity to bring these needed services to that area.

Other speakers expressed concern for the CPAMs, stating that new development will not solve existing transportation and service problems. Several commenters expressed concern regarding impacts of future growth on schools and other County services such as fire and rescue services, parks and recreation services, and library services. Several speakers also expressed concern that increased development will lead to a reduction in quality of education for County residents. A representative from a local homeowners association noted that the schools in the area were already overcrowded. Other speakers were concerned that school boundaries will change as a result of new development in the subareas. One speaker had a concern with the water supply (Lenah Run), dependant on the community well system which is run and operated by the Loudoun County Sanitation Authority.

Several speakers stated that growth cannot be stopped but should be managed through opportunities like the CPAM. One speaker suggested that the CPAM should result in improved infrastructure and services to County residents. Several speakers stated that without a CPAM, future development could lead to costly by-right developments that do not provide funding for County services. A member of the school board expressed concern regarding the provision of future school sites, noting that currently by-right developments do not have to provide school sites. Several commenters stated that existing and new residents should be provided the same level of service as Eastern Loudoun enjoys.

Fiscal Concerns

Several speakers support the proposed special assessment tax districts as a solution for funding much needed services up front. Other speakers stated that this kind of financing of a project ensures that the developers pay the full cost of impacts associated with new developments.

Several speakers expressed concern regarding the proposed viability and the financing of future residential growth. One speaker stated that the County cannot afford new development. Others questioned the costs of long term maintenance and costs of future residential development. Several speakers expressed concern regarding the proposed special assessment tax districts and the impact to future homeowners of the proposed developments. One speaker stated that the County could ultimately be responsible for outstanding debt over the long term.

One speaker suggested that a full fiscal analysis be conducted by an independent consultant regarding proposed development in the subareas.

Transportation Concerns

Several speakers stated that there is a pressing need to find solutions for improving the Route 50 corridor. One speaker stated that residents in the area currently experience prolonged commuting times to and from their places of employment. Several speakers expressed support for additional residential growth in the subareas, stating that new developments will provide opportunities for improved transportation networks.

Several speakers stated that although new development will provide improved transportation networks within the proposed developments, it is possible new development will do little to improve existing traffic concerns elsewhere in the County. Several commenters stated that the current transportation network in the south Dulles area does not work. One speaker stated that Route 50 needs to be improved to accommodate for the influx in traffic and that this cannot be accomplished by creating another 22,000 homes. A representative from a local homeowners association also noted that the new developments in the Transition Policy Area would not fix the existing problems of the transportation network. One speaker encouraged the planning commission to seek favorable alternatives such as a toll booth or a special assessment on the usage of Route 50 for current residents to produce the funds necessary for improvements. Another speaker suggested a cost analysis of future interchanges on major roads may be needed if there is increased development in the subareas.

Policy Options²:

Issue Question 4a- What level of public facilities and services should be provided in the Upper Foley and Upper Broad Run Transition subareas?

Issue Question 4b- To what extent should new development be contingent on availability of public facilities and services?

Issue Question 4a- What level of public facilities and services should be provided in the Upper Foley and Upper Broad Run Transition subareas?

Option A - Maintain the current level of public facilities and services as described in agency service plans and used to develop the countywide Capital Facilities Standards (CFS) (status quo).

Pros:

- The Capital Facilities Standards (CFS) represents the full spectrum of County facilities, giving the new residents of the Transition subarea the same service levels as residents elsewhere in the County.
- Per capita calculations provide an equitable means of evaluating impacts and proffers.
- Current CFS calculations and associated Capital Intensity Factors (CIF) have the benefit of public review and comment.

² The options and recommendations in these issue papers are not intended to be all encompassing. They are presented to assist the Planning Commission in its discussions of the various topics related to the Plan. Additional background data and policy or implementation options may be developed as the Commission proceeds.

Cons:

- The Capital Facilities Standards (CFS) do not fully account for the complete lack of facilities in the Transition subareas. In the Dulles South community, the cost of introducing services into the community was higher and has not caught up with the rate of development.
- County resources would have to be drawn from the Suburban area to pay for new facilities in the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley subareas.
- Students and customers would have to make use of existing Suburban facilities while new facilities are being planned and built.

Option B – Reduce the cost of capital facilities either through a reduction in the level of services or through innovative design, financing and other means.

Pros:

- This would allow more funding be spent on key facilities and might accelerate their completion.
- It reduces the anticipated proffer from development, reducing per unit costs and supporting workforce housing.

Cons:

- Residents may not be satisfied with the services being provided, creating an imbalance between communities.
- New design may be difficult to implement because of mandated standards, reluctance to change on the part of the users, increased cost for the initial prototypes.
- May result in increased demand on existing facilities and services in the Suburban Policy Area that are not programmed to also serve the Transition Policy Area.

Option C – Change the Capital Facilities Standards (CFS) to reflect the needs based on existing conditions.

Pros:

- This approach more accurately reflects the needs in the community rather than relying on a countywide model.
- It reduces or eliminates the lag between facilities and demand.

Cons:

- Increased service levels will increase costs to the County and the homebuyer.

Issue Question 4b- To what extent should new development be contingent on availability of public facilities and services?

Option A – Continue current policy and allow each to mitigate their share of impacts through incremental proffers and use the availability of services to evaluate rezonings.

Pros:

- Consistent with current practice and enjoys certain level of community acceptance.
- Allows developer to contribute cash or land to the facility without waiting for the facility to be available.
- Lack of facilities may not impact the rate of new development.

Option B – New rezonings should not be approved unless adequate public facilities and services are available.

Pros:

- Ensures capacity is in place before new development occurs.
- Would encourage development community to provide completed facilities as opposed to cash contributions.
- County controls the rate of new development through CIP and construction schedules.

Cons:

- Would increase the public cost since services would have to be constructed prior to development.
- Would increase the cost of housing in the transition area.

Staff recommendation:

For Issue Question 4a - What level of public facilities and services should be provided in the Upper Foley and Upper Broad Run Transition subareas?

- **Staff recommends Option C to modify the Capital Facilities Standards (CFS) for the Transition area to reflect the existing lack of facilities in the area. The approach would accelerate construction of new facilities concurrent with new development.**

For Issue Question 4b - To what extent should new development be contingent on availability of public facilities and services?

- **Staff recommends Option A to allow new development to proceed based on the applicant's willingness to mitigate capital impacts consistent with the policies**

adopted for the Transition subarea. The efficient development of areas that are within the utility service boundary of the County is important to minimize or defer the need to further expansion and to facilitate more affordable development.

Attachment 1. Buildout Analysis Methodology for Alternative Scenarios, Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Transition Subareas

Data Sources

Data for this work was extracted on June 23, 2005 from the County's Land Management Information System (LMIS). The following data were extracted for all parcels in the Upper Broad Run and Upper Foley Transition Subareas:

MCPI (Unique Parcel Identifier Number)
Primary Zoning
Policy Area
Parcel Occupancy Code (used to determine use of the parcel)
Legal Acres
Floodplain (Major and Minor)
State Use Classification
Assessments (land and improvements)

Analysis Methodology

The following method was used to determine: 1) whether a parcel was "developable"; and 2) the maximum estimated number of residential units that could be built on the parcel under the four alternative development scenarios. To determine whether a parcel was "developable," parcels were examined and either removed from the analysis, or their development potential was modified based on the following assumptions:

1. Net buildable acres includes all acreage in two subareas minus major floodplains, Lenah Run and The Marches subdivisions, all land zoned PD-GI or PD-IP, easements, and Arcola Elementary. Net buildable acreage includes moderately steep slopes, churches, and land zoned RC (13 acres).
2. Parcel by parcel analysis.
3. Parcels that are too small for development (less than 0.1 acres) were removed.
4. Parcel considered fully developable if improvements were assessed at less than \$100,000 in 2004.
5. Consideration was not given to parcels that may have private restrictive covenants that limit development as the data was not available.
6. Potential New Units at 100% residential uses:
 - Scenario 1: 4,571
 - Scenario 2: 28,324
 - Scenario 3: 32,436
 - Scenario 4: 43,120

7. For Potential Build-out Units if not 100% residential uses:

- For Scenario 1: No mix of residential uses, 100% of developable parcels assumed residential uses (based on Revised General Plan, Transition Policy Area).
- For Scenarios 2, and 3: 60% maximum residential development per developable parcel (based on land use mix ratio in Revised General Plan for the Suburban Policy Area)
- For Scenario 4: 70% maximum residential development per developable parcel (based on land use mix ratio in 1993 DSAMP).

8. Capital facility estimates are based on the projected number of single family detached, attached, and multifamily units that will be constructed for the alternative scenarios.

9. Dwelling Unit Mix Percentages based on Major Approved Residential Projects (20+ units), within the Dulles Planning Subarea, Ashburn Planning Subarea, and Countywide (2004 Loudoun County Growth Summary).

10. Residential Dwelling Unit Mix Percentages:

- | | | | |
|--------------------|---------|---------|--------|
| • Dulles Subarea: | 48% SFD | 38% SFA | 14% MF |
| • Ashburn Subarea: | 30% SFD | 29% SFA | 41% MF |
| • Countywide: | 43% SFD | 31% SFA | 26% MF |

Attachment 2. FY05 Adopted Capital Facility Standards

DEPARTMENT	CAPITAL FACILITY	FIC RECOMMENDED STANDARD
Animal Care and Control	Animal Shelter	0.079 square feet per capita
Fire & Rescue	Fire & Rescue Station	1:25,000 population
Fire & Rescue	1500-gpm Engine	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	ALS Ambulance	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Ladder Truck	1:25,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Heavy Rescue Squad	1:50,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Fire & Rescue Station - Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	1500-gpm Engine – Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	ALS Ambulance – Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Tanker – Western	1:10,000 population
Fire & Rescue	Brush Truck – Western	1:10,000 population
General Government	Office Space	1 square foot per capita
Health Department	Health Clinic	0.5 s.f of clinic space per #client visits
Juvenile Court Services Unit	Juvenile Probation Residence	1:250,000 population
Library Services	Library	0.6 square feet per capita
MHMRSA	MR Residential Facility	1 bed slot:5,375 population
MHMRSA	MH Residential Facility	1 bed slot:3,665 population
MHMRSA	MHSA Adolescent Treatment Ctr.	1 bed slot:237 youth 15-18
MHMRSA	MHSA Adolescent Group Home	1 bed slot:382 youth 16-17
MHMRSA	MHSA Adolescent Group Home	1 bed slot:957 youth 12-15
Office of Transportation Services	Regional Park & Ride Lot	1:25 s.m. suburban 1:100 s.m. county
Office of Transportation Services	Community Park & Ride Lot	1:4 s.m. suburban & towns
Office of Transportation Services	Bus Maintenance Facility	1:100 transit vehicles
PRCS	Recreation Center	1:75,000 population
PRCS	Regional Park	1:75,000 population
PRCS	District Park	1:25,000 population
PRCS	Community Park	1:10,000 population
PRCS	Teen Center	1:10,000 population 12-14
PRCS	Senior Center	1:10,000 population 55+
PRCS	Respite Center	1:15,000 population 55+
Sheriff's Office	Substation	1:75,000 population
Social Services	Juvenile Detention Center	#centers= $x \times 0.0395 / 585$
Social Services	Youth Shelter	#shelters= $x \times 0.0116 / 144$
Social Services	Transitional Homeless Shelter	#shelters= $x \times 5\% \times 3.24 \times 19\% / 45$
Social Services	Emergency Homeless Shelter	#shelters= $x \times 5\% \times 3.24 \times 68\% / 190$
Social Services	Juvenile Assessment Center	1:County
Social Services	Transitional Independ. Living Res.	1:250,000 population
Schools	Elementary School	875 students
Schools	Middle School	1184 students
Schools	High School	1600 students

Attachment 3. Board Proffer Policy Revisions, February 2005

The following policy revisions have been adopted by the Board of Supervisors. Several are awaiting a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. However, applicants may now receive capital facilities credit for transportation improvements that go beyond mitigating the project transportation impacts and the credit for the units permitted by the base zoning (by-right units) have been modified.

- **Commercial Capital Facility Contribution** – The Board proposes to add to that policy with a policy statement that calculates a commercial, per-square-foot capital facility proffer contribution for commercial properties to mitigate their impact on the County's need for public safety facilities. The two public safety departments estimate that the residential call volume represents 80% of their service calls and commercial call volume 20% of their service calls. The proposal recommends the commercial contribution rate be set at \$0.15 per gross square foot as a voluntary capital facility contribution for which a capital facility credit is given during rezoning proffer negotiations.
- **Credits for Private/HOA Constructed Recreation Facilities** - Currently, the County's policy permits a partial or full capital facility credit if the private/HOA constructed facility is programmed by the Department of Parks, Recreation and Community Services for public use. The Board recommends this credit be extended for private/HOA constructed recreational facilities that the County does not program or have public use designations. This credit would recognize that these facilities, even if not programmed by the County, do reduce the need for the County to construct public recreational facilities.
- **Fire and Rescue Geographic Standards** –The service delivery models for western and eastern Loudoun County were reviewed and it was determined that the response times, which are critical to service delivery, required different capital facility standards. The western population trigger for a station is 1:10,000 population and the eastern trigger for a station is 1:25,000 population.
- **Valuation Credit Methodology for Proffered Land Sites** – The current policy uses the “prezoned” value of land to calculate proffer credit for site proffers. The Board now proposes to use an appraisal process to determine the “post-zoning” land value. This is intended to encourage more land proffers.
- **Transportation Credit** – A review of transportation proffers and credits was conducted by the committee during several meeting sessions. The committee deferred any recommendations on policy and referred the issues to the Board's Transportation Committee (Transportation/Land Use Committee as of January 2005) for further study and analysis.